



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,686

10/15/2003

Mitch Fredrick Singer

113748-4838US

9159

27189

7590

08/07/2009

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP

530 B STREET

SUITE 2100

SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2432

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/07/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@procopio.com

PTONotifications@procopio.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/686,686	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SINGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BENJAMIN E. LANIER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2432	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BENJAMIN E. LANIER. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Samuel Lee (Reg. No. 42,791). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
           c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
     If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Novak.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Lee requested clarification on how Novak met the claimed "sub-copy version". Examiner explained how Novak was being utilized to meet the claim limitations. Mr. Lee suggested that claim amendments would be made to address what was discussed. No particular claim language was discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Benjamin E Lanier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432